

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
WACO DIVISION**

ParkerVision, Inc.

Plaintiff,

vs.

Intel Corporation

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 6:20-cv-562-ADA

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

UNOPPOSED MOTION REGARDING TRANSFER

Defendant Intel Corporation (“Intel”) respectfully moves the Court to issue an order directing that the Court’s ruling on Intel’s Motion to Transfer to the District of Oregon, or in the Alternative, to the Austin Division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a), in *ParkerVision, Inc. v. Intel Corp.*, No. 6:20-cv-108-ADA, D.I. 30 (W.D. Tex.) also apply to the above-captioned case, No. 6:20-cv-562-ADA. In support of this Motion, Intel states as follows:

1. Plaintiff ParkerVision, Inc. (“ParkerVision”) filed the above-captioned action against Intel for patent infringement in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Waco Division, on June 24, 2020 (hereinafter “*ParkerVision II*”).

2. ParkerVision filed a prior, related action against Intel in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas, Waco Division, under Case No. 6:20-cv-108-ADA, on February 11, 2020 (hereinafter “*ParkerVision I*”).

3. On July 10, 2020, Intel filed a Motion to Transfer *ParkerVision I* to the District of Oregon, or in the Alternative, to the Austin Division pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) (hereinafter the “Motion to Transfer *ParkerVision I*”) and that motion has been briefed.

4. Counsel for the parties have conferred regarding Intel’s intent to file a Motion to Transfer *ParkerVision II* to the District of Oregon, or in the Alternative, to the Austin Division.

5. Counsel for Intel has also conferred with counsel for ParkerVision about the relief requested in this motion, and ParkerVision does not oppose. The parties wish to avoid burdening the Court with unnecessary and duplicative motion practice and therefore agree that the Court's ruling on Intel's Motion to Transfer *ParkerVision I* should also apply to *ParkerVision II*.

6. WHEREFORE, Intel respectfully requests that the Court enter an Order directing that the Court's ruling on Intel's Motion to Transfer *ParkerVision I* shall also apply to *ParkerVision II*.

Dated: September 2, 2020

Michael J. Summersgill (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
Sarah B. Petty (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND
DORR LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
T (617) 526-6000
michael.summersgill@wilmerhale.com
sarah.petty@wilmerhale.com

Jason F. Choy (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*)
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND
DORR LLP
350 South Grand Avenue, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90071
T (213) 443-5300
jason.choy@wilmerhale.com

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ J. Stephen Ravel

J. Stephen Ravel
KELLY HART & HALLMAN LLP
303 Colorado, Suite 2000
Austin, Texas 78701
T (512) 495-6429
steve.ravel@kellyhart.com

James E. Wren
Texas State Bar No. 22018200
1 Bear Place, Unit 97288
Waco, Texas 76798
T (254) 710-7670
james.wren@baylor.edu

Attorneys for Defendant Intel Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

The undersigned certifies counsel conferred and Plaintiff's counsel agreed to the relief sought. Accordingly, this motion and the relief requested herein are unopposed.

/s/ J. Stephen Ravel
J. Stephen Ravel

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that, on September 2, 2020, all counsel of record who are deemed to have consented to electronic service are being served with a copy of the foregoing document via the Court's CM/ECF system in accordance with Local Rule CV-5.

/s/ J. Stephen Ravel
J. Stephen Ravel